

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,595	12/07/2001		David S. Soane	50225-8011.US02	6546
33603	7590	05/17/2004		EXAMINER	
ACLARA BIOSCIENCES, INC.				HARAN, JOHN T	
1288 PEAR AVENUE MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1733	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,595	SOANE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John T. Haran	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover shee	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma reply within the statutory minimum of od will apply and will expire SIX (6) It tute, cause the application to becom	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10			
24)	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (J.D. 11, 455 O.G. 215.	
Disposition of Claims	•		
4) Claim(s) 32-34 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 32-34 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.		
Application Papers	•		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con-			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	•	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		n Application No.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum3. Copies of the certified copies of the p			
application from the International Bur			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a		not received.	
Attachment(s)		(DTO 142)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper	ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date	(/08) 5) Notice	of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1733

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/10/04 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: in the preamble it appears "on" should read - - one - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brackett (U.S. Patent 4,875,956) in view of Parce et al (U.S. Patent 5,885,470).

Brackett is directed to a method of making a fluidic module wherein a first and second sheet of acrylic plastic substrate with planar surfaces, one which includes a structure in the surface, are apposed to one another and heated to 300 degrees Fahrenheit under pressure so that molecules at the interface of the acrylic substrates

Art Unit: 1733

transmigrate to form a morphological bond (See abstract; examples; Column 6, lines 37-47). Brackett also teaches annealing the bonded substrate at a temperature lower

than the bonding temperature to create a stress free and sealed interface (Column 7,

lines 25-39). It is noted that the glass transition temperature of acrylic is 100 degrees

Celsius (212 degrees Fahrenheit), as noted in the Modern Plastics Encyclopedia, so the

acrylic is heated above the glass transition temperature. Brackett is silent towards the

structures being microstructures.

It is notoriously well known and conventional in the fluidic module art to have microfluidic modules that contain microstructures, as shown for example in Parce et al (Column 2, lines 63-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form microfluidic modules from substrates with microstructures such as microchannels of capillary dimension, as is conventional in the art as evidenced by Parce et al, in the method of Brackett.

Brackett also teaches that the temperature is never so great as to cause the material to become viscous, which would lead to deformation and filling of the machined channels (Column 6, lines 37-40). Furthermore, Parce teaches bonding two substrates, one of which has microchannels of capillary dimensions, under heat and pressure above the glass transition temperature for a time sufficient to bond the surfaces together and there is no suggestion that the microchannels are deformed. One skilled in the art would have readily appreciated that Brackett teaches that deformation of the microchannels would be undesirable and would be motivated to adjust the bonding temperature so that such does not occur. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1733

skill in the art to bond the substrates together under sufficient heat and pressure to form a bond without out deformation of the microchannels, as such would not be desired as noted in Brackett, in the method of Brackett as modified above to have microchannels of capillary dimensions.

It is noted that support for the limitation of "heating the planar surface of the apposed first and second plastic substrates above their glass transition temperature for a time sufficient to bond the surfaces together" only goes back to 6/18/97 in application 08/878,437, now U.S. Patent 6,176,962.

Regarding claim 33, one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated heating the substrates only as much as necessary to cause the molecules to transmigrate to eliminate unnecessary use of energy and to avoid deformation of the microchannels. Furthermore one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated that this temperature would have been dependent upon a variety of factors including the material worked upon. It would have been within the purview of one skilled in the art to only heat the substrates to a temperature 2 to 5 degrees Celsius above the glass transition temperature.

Regarding claim 34, polymethylmethyacrylate is a well known and conventional material for microfluidic devices, as shown for example in Parce et al (Column 5, line 65), and it would have been obvious to use conventional materials in the method of Brackett.

Art Unit: 1733

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Brackett teaches that the bonding temperature is not so high that the material of the substrate becomes viscous and fills or deforms the machined structures and one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated doing the same when the machined structures are microchannels of capillary dimension.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John T. Haran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1217**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (8 - 5) and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John T. Haran Examiner

Art Unit 1733